Appl. No. 10/674,046 Amdt. dated 30 September 2005 Reply to Office Action of 30 June 2005

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-6, were rejected under Section 102(e) over *Pedlar*. Objection was also made to the disclosure for the use of acronyms that were not spelled-out.

Amendments set forth herein to the specification spell out, at their first instances, the acronyms CELL_PCH, URA_PCH, CUCRH, GPRS, and EDGE.

The rejection of the claims under Section 102(e) over *Pedlar* is respectfully traversed. While the Examiner asserts that the recitations of the claims are disclosed in paragraphs 11, 12, 33, and 34 of the reference, review of the reference indicates that the structure and methodology recited in the claims differ with the subject matter disclosed in the reference.

With respect to method claim 1, the method is recited to include the steps of receiving a CELL UPDATE CONFIRM message or a URA UPDATE CONFIRM message determine whether the message places the user equipment in a state that requires a response prior to entering the state, determining whether the message contains a new C-RNTI element, and using the element to send a response message in the event that a response is required and the message contains a new C-RNTI element. Claim 5 recites analogous apparatus.

Specific traverse is made to the Examiner's reliance upon *Pedlar* for showing the operation, or corresponding means, of determining whether a received CELL or URA UPDATE CONFIRM message contains a new C-RNTI element. While paragraphs 33 and 34 of the reference make mention of a cell radio network temporary identifier (C-RNTI), the cited paragraphs only state that the identifier must be known to the user equipment in order for the user equipment to send uplink data on a DCCH channel. Neither the cited paragraphs, nor the other sections of the reference, disclose, or imply, an operation, or analogous structure of determining whether a CELL or URA UPDATE CONFIRM message contains a new C-RNTI element.

Furthermore, the cited paragraphs of the reference also fail to disclose a CELL UPDATE CONFIRM message. While paragraph 42 of the reference first makes mention of a CELL UPDATE CONFIRM message, this section of the reference states that, when a CELL UPDATE CONFIRM message is received, the user equipment sends back a response. The section

Appl. No. 10/674,046 Amdt. dated 30 September 2005 Reply to Office Action of 30 June 2005

indicates that at some point thereafter, once the cell update is completed, the user equipment enters one of a CELL_FACH or CELL_DCH. Neither this additional paragraph, nor any other section of the reference, states that, when a CELL UPDATE CONFIRM message is received, a determination is made whether the message places the user equipment in a state that requires a response prior to entering the state. And, neither this additional paragraph, nor any other section of the reference, disclose determining whether the message contains a new C-RNTI element and, if so, and a response is required, of using the element to send a response message, all as recited in independent claims 1 and 5.

The dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims. These claims, accordingly, are believed to be distinguishable over the reference for these same reasons.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 5, and the dependent claims dependent thereon are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration for allowance in light of the foregoing comments is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 30 405

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.

5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400

Dallas, Texas 75225

Telephone: (214) 706-4201

Fax: (214) 706-4242

robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com